

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

EDGAR ALEXANDER MENESES,

Defendant and Appellant.

B254695

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. KA104579)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Douglas Sortino, Judge. Affirmed.

Richard B. Lennon, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In February 2014 the People charged Edgar Alexander Meneses in a felony complaint with second degree robbery (Pen. Code, § 211). On February 5, 2014 Meneses, represented by counsel, waived his rights to a preliminary hearing and a jury trial and entered a negotiated plea of no contest, orally and in writing, to second degree robbery. At the time he entered his plea, the trial court advised Meneses of his constitutional rights and the nature and consequences of the plea, which Meneses stated he understood. Defense counsel joined in the waivers of Meneses' constitutional rights. The trial court expressly found Meneses' waivers and plea were voluntary, knowing, and intelligent. In accordance with the plea agreement, the trial court suspended imposition of sentence and placed Meneses on three years of formal probation, on condition he serve 365 days in county jail, with three days credit for time served, and imposed statutory fines, fees and assessments.

Meneses filed a timely notice of appeal, checking only the box that his appeal was "based on the sentence or other matters occurring after the plea that do not affect the validity of the plea." The record does not contain a request for a certificate of probable cause.

DISCUSSION

We appointed counsel to represent Meneses on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief that did not raise any issues. In an accompanying declaration, appellate counsel stated he was unable to notify Meneses of his right to file a supplemental brief because Meneses had been released from custody and counsel did not have Meneses' current address. On May 13, 2014 we advised Meneses by mail to the county jail that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. On May 28, 2014 the notice was returned by the county

jail and marked “return to sender, attempted - not known, unable to forward” with a notation that Meneses had been released from custody.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that Meneses’ appellate counsel has fully complied with his responsibilities and that there are no arguable issues. (See *Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 118-119; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

SEGAL, J.*

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

ZELON, J.

* Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.